DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 974 JC 890 199

AUTHOR Kerschner, Lee R.; Lindahl, Charles W.
TITLE Transfer: Key to the Master Plan. Information Agenda Item 1.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Sacramento. Board of Trustees.
PUB DATE Jan 89
NOTE 33p.; Paper prepared as Information Agenda Item Number 1 at a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the California State University (Sacramento, CA, January 10-11, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; General Education; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; State Universities; Statewide Planning; Student Problems; Transfer Programs; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the role of the California State University (CSU) in renewing and strengthening the transfer function, this report includes information on the history and importance of transfer, low transfer rates and other problems, CSU and cooperative efforts to improve transfer, and joint plans of the CSU and the state's community colleges to revitalize transfer programs. Several innovations designed to streamline the transfer process are highlighted, including: (1) community college certification of fulfillment of CSU requirements; (2) students' ability to choose to fulfill the CSU graduation requirements in effect when they began at a community college, when they entered a CSU, or those in effect at graduation; (3) academic performance reports on transfers provided by the CSU to community colleges; (4) CSU fee waivers for Extended Opportunity Programs and Services participants; (5) a booklet and video for prospective community college transfers; (6) discipline-based articulation efforts; (7) the formation of transfer centers on 14 CSU campuses; (8) Project ASSIST, a computerized articulation system; and (9) the California Articulation Number system, providing standardized numbers for courses. A matrix is provided which identifies existing programs and introduces initiatives in four categories: access (i.e., ways to improve outreach activities and the identification of prospective transfers); transition (i.e., initiatives to provide community college students with CSU information, orientation, and assistance to ease transition into the university environment); academic enhancement (i.e., joint efforts by CSU and community college faculty to improve curricular cohesion and support academic articulation between the segments); and general education (i.e., steps necessary to expedite the implementation of the transfer general education curriculum and the certification process). (AYC)

ED305974

TRANSFER: KEY TO THE MASTER PLAN

The California State University
Board of Trustees
Committee on Educational Policy
Information Agenda Item 1

January 10-11, 1989

JC 890 199

CSU

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. McGraw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 1
January 10-11, 1989

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

TRANSFER: KEY TO THE MASTER PLAN

Presentation By

Lee R. Kerschner, Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Charles W. Lindahl, Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs, Educational Support

Summary

The ability of qualified students to advance from lower-division instruction in a community college to enrollment in a four-year institution is the heart of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Absent an effective transfer process, many students would be denied access to a bachelor's degree because California's public universities are among the most selective in the nation. The effectiveness of the transfer program merits continuing attention on the part of The California State University and the California Community Colleges because too few qualified community college students are transferring to four-year institutions, especially underrepresented minority students.

Maintaining an effective transfer program is particularly important to the CSU since community college transfers comprise the majority of enrollments in all majors, and well over half of the bachelor's degrees awarded each year are earned by community college transfer students. Although a wide variety of efforts are underway, more can be done to reinvigorate transfer programs as called for by the Master Plan Review Commission.

This is the first of a series of reports to the Board of Trustees on transfer. The primary purpose of this agenda item is to consider how CSU can work more closely with the California Community Colleges to support the renewal of the transfer option. This item includes information on the history and importance of transfer, transfer problems, CSU and intersegmental efforts to improve transfer, and joint CSU-California Community College plans for revitalizing transfer programs.

Academic Affairs, Educational Support
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

ITEM

Agenda Item 1
January 10-11, 1989

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

TRANSFER: KEY TO THE MASTER PLAN

Introduction

The ability of qualified students to proceed from lower-division instruction in a community college to enrollment in a four-year institution is the heart of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The effectiveness of the transfer program merits continuing, systematic attention on the part of The California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges because too few community college students are transferring to four-year institutions, especially underrepresented minority students. The most important initiatives that have been and are being mounted are most effective when conceived, developed, and implemented jointly by the two segments. The primary purpose of this agenda item is to consider how CSU can work more closely with the California Community Colleges to support the renewal of the transfer option.

This agenda item includes information on the: history of transfer; importance of transfer; identification of transfer problems; CSU efforts to improve transfer; intersegmental efforts to improve transfer; and joint CSU-California Community Colleges plans for revitalizing the transfer programs.

THE HISTORY OF TRANSFER*

The authors of the 1960 Master Plan established a degree of integration among the State's three postsecondary segments — the University of California, which admits students from the top one-eighth of recent high school graduates; The California State University, which accepts applicants from the upper one-third of recent high school graduates; and the 107 community colleges, which have open admission, thus creating a comprehensive system that aspires to both access and excellence.

Foreseeing an unprecedented demand for enrollment in public higher education, the 1960 Master Plan authors decided to divert an estimated 50,000 lower-division students to two-year colleges by reducing the eligibility pool for the four-year segment and asking each institution to reduce lower-division enrollment to 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment by 1975. The redirection policy was based on the belief that students accommodated in the community colleges would have the same opportunity to complete their lower-division studies and go on to upper-division study at a four-year institution as those admitted to four-year institutions as freshmen.

The ability to transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions was a cornerstone of the State's 1960 Master Plan, and one of the most concrete expressions of the State's commitment to both access and quality. The Master Plan provided assurances that the State's community colleges would remain low cost, open admission institutions, and that all community college students who met admission requirements to CSU or UC would have the transfer option open to them.

From 1960 to 1975, the California Community Colleges grew and prospered as intended under the 1960 Master Plan. Many students who were eligible to enter the University of California or The California State University as freshmen, as well as others who were seeking a second chance, enrolled in community colleges for the first half of their undergraduate instruction. As a result, UC and CSU were able to meet the 40 percent goal for lower-division enrollment in 1975, and the community colleges were able to offer strong, comprehensive transfer programs.

In the mid-1970s, however, the number of high school graduates began to decline in California, and all postsecondary institutions were faced with the prospect of declining enrollments. As the total number of high school graduates continued to decline, CSU and UC began to attract a larger percentage of high school

*The transfer history section has been excerpted in part from *The Master Plan Renewed.*

graduates who were eligible for admission as freshmen. Thus, fewer high school graduates enrolled as full-time transfer students in the community colleges. As enrollment in the transfer programs declined, those programs became less attractive to baccalaureate-bound students who might have enrolled, and a downward spiral began. With the changes in community college funding that followed passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, course offerings were reduced and counseling and testing services curtailed. The problem was compounded by the efforts of some community colleges to so broaden their programs that their mission became obscured.

The State is now in the process, with the adoption of AB 1725, of revitalizing the community colleges so that they can once again offer solid opportunities for students to progress through the system toward a baccalaureate. A great deal of attention was devoted to the mission of the community colleges during the recently completed Master Plan review process.

Following are the key transfer issues identified by the Master Plan review:

- a more focused community college mission statement
- a stronger governance structure
- intersegmentally developed transfer core curriculum
- mandatory assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up
- minimum skill levels for all courses

However, these efforts can succeed only if the community colleges attract a larger proportion of baccalaureate-bound students. This will require the active assistance of The California State University and the University of California in revitalizing the transfer option.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSFER

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) has recently reaffirmed the importance of transfer to the State's higher education system.

> The Community College transfer function is essential to fulfilling California's commitment to access to higher education for all who can benefit from it. It is imperative for assuring equality of educational opportunity for all of California's young people. As a result, the California Postsecondary Education Commission calls for a reaffirmation of the Community College transfer function and a recommitment to it by all of California postsecondary education. (CPEC Commission Report, *Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer*, March 1985, p. 7)

The key element necessary for California's system of higher education to work as intended is transfer, i.e., the opportunity for students to attend a community college for the first half of their baccalaureate work, then, if they have performed satisfactorily, to be able to transfer and continue their studies without interruption at one of the State's four-year institutions. In the words of the Master Plan Review Commission:

> Those who enroll in a community college must know that if they prepare themselves by successfully completing the transfer curriculum they can progress to the upper-division levels in a four-year university and, where capacity permits, at the public campus of their choice. An effective transfer system is essential to meeting the needs of California's highly diverse population. Absent an effective transfer system, there will be neither unity nor equity. (*The Master Plan Renewed, p. 16)*

Maintaining an effective transfer program is particularly vital to the CSU, since community college transfers comprise the majority of CSU enrollments in all majors and well over half of the bachelor's degrees awarded each year. At least 900,000 community college students have transferred to the CSU since 1970, and since 1976 over 350,000 CSU bachelor degrees have been awarded to community college students.

IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFER PROBLEMS

Qualified students have a right to progress from a community college to a baccalaureate-level institution with a smooth transition and a minimum loss of time and credit. Impediments to progress must be eliminated if this right is to have meaning, and if the transfer programs of the community colleges are to be attractive to high school graduates regardless of their original eligibility for admission to The California State University or the University of California. An effective transfer process is fundamental to achievement of the objectives of the State's postsecondary education system.

However, as the data in Table 1 show, there was a decline from 1977 to 1986 in the actual number of community college students transferring to the CSU. This decline raised concerns among educators and legislators and spurred a number of actions designed to facilitate transfer and raise the transfer rates. Slight increases in transfer enrollments are noted in 1987 and 1988.

TABLE 1

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Number of California Community College Undergraduate Transfers to the CSU
1970 - 1988

Year	Fall Transfers	College Year Transfers
1970-71	29,059	49,245
1971-72	32,546	52,988
1972-73	34,619	53,820
1973-74	33,089	51,335
1974-75	32,646	51,144
1975-76	35,537	52,917
1976-77	32,653	51,230
1977-78	34,001	51,159
1978-79	31,609	47,430
1979-80	30,483	46,326
1980-81	30,527	46,649
1981-82	30,072	45,283
1982-83	29,824	45,400
1983-84	30,297	45,726
1984-85	30,134	45,476
1985-86	29,682	45,469
1986-87	27,761	43,666
1987-88	28,257	44,701
1988-89	28,300*	

*Preliminary data

The data in Table 2, however, reveal that the transfer rate, when calculated as the percent of high school graduates who enter community colleges and then transfer to a CSU or UC campus three years later, has not declined. Rather, it has been remarkably stable and is now at its highest point in the last decade. The decline in the number of community college transfers is associated primarily with the declining number of students enrolled in the community colleges. Community college enrollments have, in turn, been affected by both the declining number of high school graduates and lower percentages of the graduates choosing to attend a community college.

TABLE 2

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Transfers to CSU as a Percent of High School Graduates Entering California Community Colleges Three Years Earlier, 1974-1988

Year	Number of H.S. Grads	Percent of H.S. Grads to Community Colleges	Number of H.S. Grads to Community Colleges	CSU Transfers Fall Term	Total as a Percent of H.S. Grads Entering CCC 3 Years Earlier*
1971	—	56.0	129,358	—	—
1972	—	45.6	128,918	—	—
1973	291,969	41.8	122,043	33,089	—
1974	289,714	41.3	119,652	32,646	—
1975	293,941	43.1	126,689	35,537	—
1976	289,454	41.7	120,702	32,653	26.8
1977	285,360	43.3	123,561	34,001	28.4
1978	283,841	41.4	117,510	31,609	25.0
1979	278,548	42.1	117,269	30,483	25.3
1980	270,971	43.0	116,518	30,527	24.7
1981	260,229	42.1	109,556	30,072	25.6
1982	265,924	42.8	113,815	29,824	25.4
1983	262,160	37.9	99,359	30,297	26.0
1984	257,633	36.3	93,521	30,134	27.5
1985	251,143	33.0	82,877	29,682	26.1
1986	248,894	36.3	90,349	27,761	27.9
1987	262,921	34.4	90,445	28,257	30.2
1988	—	—	—	28,300**	34.1

*The Total Number of Transfers in this table are those for the Fall term only.
**Preliminary

Despite the fact that the transfer rate has remained relatively stable, the concern about transfer is still appropriate for at least two reasons. The process and requirements for transfer are perceived by some to be complex and can be intimidating. Although progress is being made in reducing the complexities, more can and must be done to improve the transfer process and communicate important information to prospective transfer students and their counselors. The more persistent and perplexing transfer problems include:

- Misunderstanding about general education/breadth requirements;
- Confusion about prerequisite courses for the major;
- Inconsistencies among CSU campuses on the applicability of courses meeting the American Institution and Government requirement;
- Confusion about the extent to which courses applicable toward the major may be counted toward general education/breadth requirements;
- Inconsistencies among CSU campuses in accepting partial certification of completion of general education/breadth requirements;
- Inadequate or out-of-date articulation agreements;
- Inconsistencies between the two segments in financial aid application and award processes that confuse students.

Most of the shortcomings in the transfer process noted above deal with the CSU aspect of transfer. As has been discussed at recent California Community College (CCC) Board of Governor's meetings, there are many dimensions to the challenge of increasing community college attendance and transfer activity that are being undertaken by the community colleges. Some of these include:

- Implementation of "Matriculation Programs" that involve assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up on all newly enrolled community college students;
- Development of a systematic outreach and information dissemination program to high school students;
- Initiating and managing intersegmental 2 + 2 vocational programs between high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions;
- Recommendation for the consideration of full-time articulation officers on community college campuses;
- Continuation of CSU/CCC Joint Projects which began in 1987-88;
- Development and implementation by 1990 of a statewide CCC Management Information System which will provide, among other benefits, the ability to follow students' progression through the system and identify prospective transfers by gender and ethnicity;
- Expand and strengthen Transfer Centers, Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST), and California Number System (CAN);
- Provide for the increased involvement of CCC faculty in pre-transfer academic advising and in the joint intersegmental development of competency standards for lower-division baccalaureate level courses.

A recent statement from the Board of Governors and Chancellor is reflective of the California Community Colleges' renewed vision for transfer.

> The Board and Chancellor will continue to strengthen the community college transfer function by supporting efforts to better prepare students for transfer and the demands of upper division study, including improved academic and career counseling, review and revision of the structure of the associate degree, and closer curriculum articulation in both academic and applied fields leading to the baccalaureate degree.
>
> The Board and Chancellor will undertake efforts to secure transfer for all students who complete community college transfer requirements and qualify for admission to the four-year segments. (California Community Colleges, Board of Governors, *Basic Agenda, 1988-89*, p. 7)

A major purpose of transfer is to provide access to a baccalaureate-granting institution for underrepresented minorities, many of whom do not meet the freshman admission requirements of the four-year institutions. The data in Table 3 demonstrate that the transfer program is not fulfilling its potential for increasing minority access to the four-year institutions. Not only are blacks and Hispanics underrepresented in their original rates of postsecondary enrollment, they are further underrepresented in the group that begins in the community colleges and then transfers.

TABLE 3

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Enrollment Percentages for Major Ethnic Groups

Ethnic Group	1986 High School Graduates[1]	Fall 1987 CCC Full-Time Credit Enrollment[2]	Fall 1987 New CCC Transfers to CSU
American Indian	.7%	1.3%	1.3%
Asian	8.2	11.7	10.1
Black	7.9	8.3	5.7
Filipino	2.2	3.1	2.2
Hispanic	19.3	14.7	11.2
Pacific Islander	.5	—	.4
White, Non Hispanic	61.2	58.7	69.1
Others	—	2.2	—
Totals, All Groups	100%	100%	100%

[1]CPEC Eligibility Study

[2]California Community Colleges, Report on Enrollment Fall 1987

CSU EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TRANSFER

The CSU has for many years distinguished itself through policy and practice as the State's baccalaureate granting institution most open, responsive, and attractive to community college transfer students. CSU

has pioneered notable innovations to streamline the transfer process. Additional information on most of these activities is included in the matrix at the conclusion of this agenda item.

1. Community College Certification of Fulfillment of CSU Requirements

CSU's major contribution to expediting the movement of students from community colleges to its campuses is certification. The CSU delegates authority to the respective community colleges to certify courses applicable toward the CSU curriculum: (1) courses that transfer for baccalaureate credit; (2) courses that fulfill CSU general education requirements; and (3) courses that fulfill the American History and Institutions requirement.

The implications of this policy are far-reaching. They reinforce the alignment of the community college transfer curriculum and CSU lower division academic programs. Community college catalogs and/or transcripts carry designations of certification. This policy ensures common admission standards and credit acceptance for transfer applicants throughout the nineteen CSU campuses.

2. Choice of Graduation Requirements

Students who remain in attendance in regular sessions at any combination of California Community Colleges and CSU campuses may, for purposes of meeting graduation requirements, elect to meet the requirements in effect at the campus from which they will graduate either:

(1) at the time they began such attendance, or

(2) at the time of entrance to the CSU campus, or

(3) at the time of graduation.

3. Academic Performance Reports

In 1982 staff introduced systemwide student academic performance reports for each community college sending five or more students to the CSU. These reports reflect the number of students transferring to each CSU campus, the community college GPA of transferring students, the first year CSU campus GPA of the same cohort, and comparisons of these data with all transfer and all native students. In addition, individual CSU campuses annually send student-specific information on academic performance to community colleges in their service area. The Universitywide Academic Performance Report on first-time transfers was expanded in 1986 to include information on upper-division and lower-division transfers, grade point averages in the major field, and ethnic representation among the transfer student population.

4. CSU Fee Waiver for Extended Opportunity Program Services (EOPS)

The CSU has implemented an application fee waiver program for all community college Extended Opportunity Program Services students who apply to the CSU. The waiver of fees was authorized through passage of AB 1114 in 1986. Implementation procedures were defined by a joint CCC-CSU committee effective with the 1987-88 school year. The fee waiver program ensures that the cost of filing an application for admission does not impede the transfer of low-income EOPS students.

5. Booklet for Prospective Community College Transfers

In 1985 CSU produced its first systemwide publication for prospective transfers, *The CSU and You: A Guide for Community College Transfers to The California State University*. Over 150,000 copies

annually have been distributed to community college and high school students. The booklet contains information about transfer to CSU, admission and financial aid procedures, and a summary of CSU requirements for transfer with particular attention to General Education. It is now being updated to include recent admission policy changes and information on the new transfer general education curriculum.

6. **CSU Transfer Video**

CSU Chancellor's Office staff, in collaboration with the Communications Department at CSU, Fullerton, produced a transfer recruitment video, *CSU: What a Difference!*, which is distributed to counseling centers and transfer centers at all community colleges and is being used effectively by CSU outreach staff.

INTERSEGMENTAL EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TRANSFER

Several important intersegmental efforts to improve transfer have been undertaken.

Discipline Based Articulation

One of the most promising initiatives launched by CSU and the California Community Colleges began with a joint conference in November 1987, which included faculty representation from the two segments in English and mathematics. The entire focus of this conference was on ways to improve preparation and articulation in these fundamental disciplines. Following the conference, an RFP process identified regional approaches which will be jointly funded to address further refinements in articulation, testing and assessment, and, most important, competency-based agreements concerning English and mathematics curricula between the two segments.

Transfer Centers

Fourteen CSU campuses are currently providing services to 20 community colleges with Transfer Centers selected largely on the basis of high concentrations of underrepresented minority students. The purpose of the intersegmental project is to increase the number of students who transfer, particularly underrepresented students. CSU representatives visit community college transfer centers on a routine basis to meet with prospective transfer students. Preliminary results of an external evaluation indicate that the Centers have been effective in improving transfer information available to community college students, promoting articulation of curricula across segments, and increasing the involvement of faculty in outreach services.

Project ASSIST

Implementation of Project ASSIST, a computerized articulation system, has been expanded to ten CSU campuses. The system provides students with a cross-reference of transfer course credit, as well as courses applicable to CSU general education requirements. A report completed by an external evaluator indicates that ASSIST is currently being used in the advisement process at some campuses. The ASSIST software is operational and capable of producing accurate and timely progress reports for individual students. The ASSIST system is the first intersegmental statewide data base that contains course lists and articulation agreements for participating CSU, UC, and community college campuses.

California Articulation Number (CAN)

In 1984, CPEC reviewed a variety of approaches for common course numbering among the segments. After a national search for models, the Commission recommended a program conceived and developed at CSU, Sacramento called the California Articulation Number (CAN) system. This voluntary program provides the opportunity for participating colleges and universities to assign codes to courses

in participating institutions which can be accepted in lieu of each other. Based on existing articulation agreements, this approach provides a means of clearly identifying commonly transferred courses through the use of CAN numbers in campus catalogs and class schedules. Currently, CAN focuses on commonly taught lower-division courses that are introductory in nature. Funding for the expansion of the CAN system has been allocated from the systemwide offices of the three public postsecondary segments. General fund support was provided in 1988-89 to further the development of CAN in the CSU.

Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC)

The California Education Round Table and the Intersegmental Coordinating Council have accorded high priority to improvement of transfer. The Transfer and Articulation cluster, established by the Council, is in its second year of operation and is effectively addressing a wide range of issues related to strengthening the transfer process in California.

CSU ACTION ON MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRANSFER

Following publication of *The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education* in July 1987, the CSU Chancellor's Office initiated conversations with campus and other public segment representatives in a variety of forums. These formal and informal discussions focused on methods to address independently and collectively the major issues presented in this important document.

Many CSU faculty and staff have already responded to the challenge to support initiatives for new and more aggressive outreach and recruitment, participation in a growing number of "2 + 2" career ladder programs, intensified efforts to coordinate transition and orientation services between CCC's and CSU, and the intersegmental establishment of Transfer Centers, Project ASSIST, and CAN.

Most important, CSU and CCC have entered into a joint projects agreement to fund faculty discipline-based efforts to develop more cohesive curricula and to reach common understandings about content mastery expected of lower-division course work in specified academic areas.

The "transfer core curriculum," recommended by the Master Plan Review Commission and enacted in statute through AB 1725, is the most important component for improvements in the transfer process. Agreement by The California State University, the California Community Colleges, and the University of California on a common transfer general education curriculum will simplify the admissions process and ensure prospective transfers that they will have fulfilled all lower-division general education requirements of any receiving university, if they have completed the requirements of the common transfer core curriculum with satisfactory grades.

Because all three segments of public higher education are involved in transfer, the initial development of the transfer curriculum was undertaken by the Intersegmental Committee of the academic senates, composed of the Executive Committees of the academic senates of the three segments. The Intersegmental Committee proceeded quickly to address this key recommendation, with important leadership provided by Dr. Ray Geigle, Chair of the CSU Academic Senate, who was, at that time, also Chair of the Intersegmental Committee, and by the other members of the CSU Academic Senate Executive Committee. The final draft of the general education transfer curriculum is being considered by the CSU Academic Senate in January 1989, with final action expected in the spring of 1989.

JOINT CSU-CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PLANS FOR IMPROVING THE TRANSFER FUNCTION

The California State University and the California Community Colleges can be credited with the development of a long and mutually beneficial relationship that extends over thirty years. During massive growth and

diversification in both segments, this relationship has been strengthened through the continuing evolution of jointly developed policies and practices designed to maintain and improve academic articulation. The continuing emphasis on improving transfer signals the high priority CSU assigns to serving community college transfer students, as stipulated in the original Master Plan and reiterated in subsequent reviews.

The California State University recognizes its responsibility to work as partners with the California Community Colleges to "reinvigorate transfer programs" so that "Community College transfer programs (can be) returned to their vital role in the Master Plan, thus enhancing student choice among the segments for which they are eligible," as recommended by the Master Plan Review Commission (*The Master Plan Renewed*, p. 14). We propose to build on the fundamentally sound transfer policies and practices and favorable relations that have been developed between the two segments.

As the first step in jointly identifying persistent transfer problems and developing more effective means of dealing with them, Chancellor's Office staff consulted with community college colleagues in developing the comprehensive matrix of possible actions that follow. Each item is developed with respect to current status, action recommended, who should be responsible for the action, process and consultation required, timeline, and resource implications.

The matrix, entitled *Transfer Renewal*, builds on existing programs and introduces several initiatives that have been suggested by faculty and staff, or which emanate directly from recommendations contained in *The Master Plan Renewed*. Many of the recommendations have been selected largely because they lend themselves to CSU-community college collaboration. These recommendations are presented in four categories:

- *Access* — ways to improve outreach activities and develop better means of identifying prospective transfers;

- *Transition* — initiatives to provide community college students with CSU information, orientation, and assistance designed to ease their movement into the university environment;

- *Academic Enhancement* — actions that should be undertaken through joint faculty efforts to improve curricular cohesion and support academic articulation between the segments;

- *General Education* — steps necessary to expedite implementation of the transfer general education curriculum and the certification process.

Another presentation will be made to the Board of Trustees later this year to report on the progress in developing these ideas and to seek support for any policy or fiscal initiatives necessary to sustain CSU's role in improving the transfer program. We anticipate a similar presentation to the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors to further emphasize the importance of cooperatively addressing this critical issue.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
A. ACCESS: Ways to encourage CCC students to transfer to CSU- emphasis on underrepresented populations.						
1. Transfer compact, contract; upon meeting criteria stipulated by participating institutions, CSU campus "guarantees" admission via a formal signed "contract" with student.	At least eight CSU campuses have initiated this approach with approximately 20 CCC's; appears to have "Hawthorne effect" even though it reflects long-standing CSU policy; students find it safe, appealing and reassuring.	Expand. Practice is growing in both UC and CSU; some campuses are expanding to include impacted programs; especially useful for educational equity populations. Generally conducted at regional level within campus service areas.	C.O. take the lead- AAES; consultation with Academic Programs as needed. Campuses initiate process and expand to as many depts/ majors as requested or appropriate.	Implementation at local level; consultation with academic depts/ majors; joint CCC/ CSU discipline faculty meetings needed prior to implementation; Relations with Schools offices develop forms, disseminate and process; regional intersegmental counselor groups may be able to implement agreements.	Proceed immediately	Limited. Admissions and Relations with Schools staff should assume responsibility for implementation of transfer contracts.
2. Development of common or compatible data systems with elements suitable for tracking progress of prospective transfers.	Some local/regional activity has begun, primarily through existing transfer center initiative; no systematic approach at present.	Expand. Needs to occur at statewide CCC and CSU C.O. levels as well as in local regions; goal is to maintain systemwide contact with prospective transfers; critical for maintenance of CSU contact with prospective transfers and for faculty pre-major assessment.	C.O.-AAES, Analytic Studies; Campus IR units and student affairs (admissions, financial aid and student services component).	Joint CCC C.O. and CSU C.O.- design systemwide data base; review any existing data tape analyses; collaborate with UC efforts.	Systemwide effort completed by June 1990. Local efforts should be in place within a reasonable period following completion of systemwide effort. Should move in sync with CCC matriculation programs.	Staff suppport needed to develop and implement a data system; probably based on IBM or compatible microcomputers. Staff will explore alternatives and determine appropriate funding level.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
3. Improvement in CCC student pre-transfer advising using technology and new data base.	Limited sharing of data on CCC pre-transfers between CCCs and CSU's.	Implement pilot programs; emphasize use of data bases developed in #2 above.	C.O.-AAES, campus admissions and evaluation units; counseling offices in CCC's; CSU departmental faculties.	CCC and CSU C.O. assist in implementation, monitor and assess effectiveness; local campuses engage in pilot efforts.	Pilots selected by spring 1990.	Consider funding through RFP process of at least 5 pilots to implement computer-based academic advising system at 50K per pilot; ultimate goal would be systemwide implementation.
4. Outreach to CSU eligible community college students, particularly those from underrepresented ethnic populations.	A few campuses seeking enrollment growth have targeted this group.	Effective "pipeline" approaches should be developed for this group; those who remain with CCC's for two years (or 56+ units) should receive special academic (major) advising and student services counseling, particularly for Financial Aid.	C.O.-AAES provide impetus and direction; campuses implement plans jointly with CCC's.	Work closely with CCC's to target, identify and support students interested in transfer.	Immediately.	Limited; targeted outreach to CCC students should be given greater priority by campus outreach units.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
5. Transfer Centers - Provision of transfer advising and services to targeted underrepresented CCC students.	Fourteen CSU campuses are currently participating in the intersegmental project; CSU representatives visit targeted community colleges on a routine basis to meet with prospective transfer students. Preliminary results of an external evaluation indicate that the Centers have been effective in improving transfer information available to community college students, promoting articulation of curricula across segments, and increasing the involvement of faculty in outreach services.	Expansion of CSU's participation in the Transfer Center project should be supported. Since the majority of Hispanic and black college students are enrolled at the community colleges and since these groups continue to be underrepresented in the CSU, outreach efforts should be increased significantly.	C.O.-AAES, should take the lead in trying to secure additional Transfer Center funding.	Consider recommending support for a budget change proposal for 1990-91.	1990-91	Approximately $1,000,000 to CSU to expand the Transfer Center program to 20 additional community colleges; CC has submitted budget requests to expand this program.
6. Project ASSIST - improvement in articulation information to students via use of computerized data base.	Ten CSU campuses are funded for ASSIST, a computerized articulation system which provides students with a cross-reference of transfer course credit, as well as courses applicable to CSU general education requirements. A report on ASSIST software completed by an external evaluator indicates that the ASSIST software is operational and is currently being used in the advisement process at some campuses.	ASSIST has been endorsed by the CSU Chancellor's Office; its implementation should be encouraged at all CSU campuses. ASSIST enhances transfer outreach by providing on-site computerized evaluation of transfer credit - both progress toward the major and toward completion for general education requirements. Funding should be requested to expand CSU's participation in ASSIST.	C.O.-AAES should take the lead in securing funding.	Consider recommending submission of a budget change proposal for 1990-91.	1990-91	Approximately $560,000 to expand ASSIST to 9 more campuses; installation costs to be followed by annual support to maintain and update course lists and articulation agreements.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
7. Development of articulated career education programs (2+2) to the baccalaureate.	At least 5 CSU campuses have initiated special means of articulating CCC career education programs, both AA's and certificate, to the baccalaurate. In 1988 resources become available through legislative action to fund up to 20 specific 2+2+2 career education projects. Twelve CSU campuses are included in the projects selected for funding. CCC's mandated to establish intersegmental faculty advisory councils for vocational areas.	CSU campuses should encourage appropriate departments and majors to work with local community colleges, as well as ROP's, business and industry, to identify areas of need for baccalaureate education and to work within existing curricula to design programs for community college students desiring advancement. CCC and CSU campus outreach staffs can develop means of effectively disseminating information on availability of new opportunities as can local business and industry.	CSU & CC C.O.'s AA - monitor, encourage and assess; CSU School Deans and AVP's responsible for encouraging such linkages in appropriate majors with counterparts in CCC's.	Basing this approach on faculty initiatives the consultation with local business and industry is critical; needs assessment should be jointly conducted by CSU and CCC's.	State-funded programs began Dec., 1988;some CSU established programs have been in place for several years; new programs can be explored immediately.	Limited: Some released time for implementation and coordination of programs may be required.
8. Improvement in CSU systemwide and campus outreach materials for CCC students.	C.O. produces "CSU and You: A Guide to Community College Transfers" - scheduled to be revised and distributed in Spring 1989; also, produces video "CSU, What a Difference!"; both are distributed to all CCC's. Dearth of campus outreach materials specifically targeted to transfers.	Expand and improve - particularly campus materials; target transfers inluding ed equity populations and older students; increases in Blacks and Hispanic enrollments in near future will depend largely on effective recruitment from CCC's. Campus should review materials, significantly develop or reprioritize resources to assure adequate outreach to CCC's.	C.O.-AAES; CSU campus CIO's outreach/recruitment and articulation personnel.	Recommend advisory groups comprised mainly of community college representatives.	Proceed immediately with a goal of improved campus materials by Fall 1989.	Campuses should review materials, develop or reprioritize resources to assure adequate outreach to CCC's; C.O. costs for revision booklet have been allocated for 1988-89. Additional resources needed for new video and posters.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
B. TRANSITION: Programs and approaches designed to smooth transfer and eliminate real or perceived barriers.						
1. Improve coordination of transition/ orienation programs between CCC student services and CSU student affairs areas.	Transfer centers have assisted in some areas but have not had significant impact on broader spectrum of services specifically for transfer students.	Appoint a joint CCC-CSU task force to review student services and delivery systems in both segments; identify similarities and differences and assign a joint committee of student affairs officers from the segments to develop new models and guidelines.	CCC C.O.; CSU C.O.-AAES	Appropriate V.C.'s in each segment appoint the task force; should include representatives from a wide range of student services used by those considering transfer and those who do transfer.	As soon as possible.	Limited; some resources for travel and O&E not to exceed $5,000.
2. Improve articulation of financial aid policies, practices, and information dissemination in the two segments.	Differing policies for application and award of financial aid are confusing to students; both information dissemination and allocation practices should be reviewed with the objective of better coordination.	a. Support lottery proposal for experimental outreach to CCC Cal Grant B recipients. b. New CSU Financial Aid Advisory Committee prioritize this issue.	CCC-C.O. and CSU C.O.-AAES Financial Aid and Outreach offices	Disseminate recommendations of Financial Aid Advisory Committee to staff in both segments; if policy change required, develop necessary legislation and consultation with Student Aid Commission.	a. A proposal has been submitted for pilot funding from lottery revenue. b. Preliminary recommendations from Financial Aid Advisory Committee by November, 1989.	a. Will pursue $14,700 of lottery funds. b. Unknown

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
3. Transfer student pre CSU enrollment diagnostic testing and followup in mathematics and English.	A few community colleges currently are experimenting with use of the Math Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP) in Algegra I and/or Intermediate Algebra to assess for CSU General Education requirements in Quantitative Reasoning; conforms in purpose to CCC assessment philosophy as a component of matriculation plan.	Expand testing of community college students anticipating transfer to CSU; passing at intermediate level indicates probable G.E. readiness; provides excellent tool for diagnosing mathematics deficiencies which could/should be remediated at CCC level.	MDTP funded in CSU through API (college level) and CAPP (K-12 level) AA/R&D	CCC-identification of testing instruments at campus discretion subject to CCC C.O. approval; consultation required at both state and local levels - both faculty and administrators.	At least one year to familiarize CCC faculty and administrators with MDTP program, begin fall, 1989.	Approximately $500,000 is needed to implement pre-enrollment diagnostic testing for CCC students.
(Mathematics)						
(English)	CCC/CSU faculty are recommending the use of EPT to place CCC students in composition courses; this would improve CCC transfer student performance in CSU writing-related curricula and in satisfying CSU GWAR; currently CSUSB involved in regional holistic scoring with local CCC's.	Should be expanded statewide to include additional regional efforts; this type of writing assessment should be instituition-alized for all CCC students anticipating transfer; training of faculty in scoring will aid course articulation.	CSU C.O.-AAES & API	CCC C.O. - fund for educational improvement. Local CCC/& CSU's develop projects; regional conferences needed.	Projects can begin immed-iately as local resources permit; statewide efforts will hasten the process.	RFP currently in field that includes such joint ventures; some CCC's unlikely to participate unless additional funds are made available.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
4. Develop transfer clubs/organizations at both CCC's and CSU's.	A few community colleges have developed transfer clubs that are well received and successful; such organizations have not been developed on CSU campuses.	Identify a few CSU's and corresponding CCC's to further develop this effort; CSU student participants could serve as interns and/or mentors to prospective transfers; emphasize underrepresented students and use academic disciplines as a base for outreach operation; incorporate career planning component.	CCC and CSU C.O.'s develop plan to select campuses that are receptive to the idea; implementation at local level.	C.O.'s monitor and access effectiveness of approach.	Planning and identification of campuses spring, 1989.	Limited.
5. EOP-EOPS pilot projects: assess impact.	Seven CSU's and 50 CCC's currently involved in pilot effort to improve transfer and ease transition; operational for 2 years; final report to CPEC due September, 1990.	Assessment of second year of operation in progress; completion anticipated by January, 1989; if positive, anticipate future expansion.	CSU-C.O. AARES CCC-C.O.-EOPS	Assessment to be shared broadly with participating colleges; decision on expansion resides with segmental C.O.'s and CPEC.	If expansion proposed, implementation should begin spring 1990.	None.
6. Development of "transfer centers" on CSU campuses.	At least two CSU campuses have established such centers; community college counselors recommend that CSU campuses adopt this practice.	Expand systematically as part of orientation-transition services for CCC transfers; primarily a referral center with some special assistance in adapting to university expectations.	C.O.-AARES; local campus student service units.	Consultation with representative sampling of transfer students enrolled on CSU campuses to ascertain types of assistance needed; collaboration with Learning Assistance Centers, academic advising and retention programs; request input from CCC counselors.	Campuses currently funded for Transfer Centers may be able to initiate immediately; others will require review and reorganization of resources.	At least one half-time person and minimal operational expenses are needed to implement this effort; total initial cost to system $570K.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
7. CAN system - intersegmental effort to assign California Articulation Number to commonly taught lower division courses that can be used "in lieu" of each other to fulfill certain transfer requirements.	Has been studied and identified by CPEC as the course numbering system of most promise for California; CAN management through CSU, Sacramento and intersegmentally funded; currently 82 CCC's, 14 CSU's and 2 UC's have qualified and approved CAN numbers for 2,972 courses; 1988-89 CSU budget provides special funding to enhance articulation and implementation at selected campuses; Chancellor Reynolds has issued formal written support to campuses.	Expand to all CCC's, CSU's and UC's.	CCC and CSU Chancellor's Office and UC President's office provide resources and assume leadership; project endorsed by CCC and CSU academic senates; on campuses faculty and articulation staff responsible for implementation.	Broad consultation through intersegmental advisory board for three years; further consultation needed with campus faculties.	On-going; however, segments should commit to all campuses identifying at least 20 CAN courses by 1990.	Effective process requires a a full-time articulation officer on each campus; some involvement possible with existing resources, but is a major undertaking for large campuses, i.e., PCP for 1988-89 provides approximately 50K to each of four large CSU campuses that collectively admit about 20,500 transfers annually.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
C. ACADEMIC ENHANCEMENT: academic programs, advising, articulation and curriculum specifically issues amenable to faculty efforts.						
1. API resources for joint CCC-CSU faculty projects.	API funds are currently allocated to joint projects with CCC in subject areas; Napa conference in 1987 laid the ground work for regional projects in English and mathmetics in 1988-89.	Expand and modify to include additional subject areas and majors; efforts should continue to focus on joint faculty identification of competencies expected as outcomes of lower-division course work and content mastery requisite for entrance to upper-division study.	CCC C.O. and CSU C.O. - AAPP responsible for systemwide funding, general direction and outcome assessment; CSU campuses responsible for development of regional approaches with CCC's.	Continue CSU and CCC faculty consultation through subject area conferences similar to 1987 Napa conference; encourage use of intersegmental Competency Statements and translation of these standards into information to be used for curricular change or programmatic improvement.	On-going; begin spring 1989 with preparation of 1990-91 BCP.	Systemwide joint projects currently funded at $50,000; will consider recommending 1990-91 BCP that would increase system funding to $70,000 to match CCC contribution.
2. Joint CCC/CSU review of transfer academic advising.	Transfer academic advising in CCC's is primarily a function of counseling centers, limited CCC faculty involvement; academic advising for upper division (major) students in CSU is primarily a faculty responsibility; increased involvement of CCC faculty is needed (currently under discussion in CCC Statewide Senate).	Initiate a joint faculty/counselor review process with staff support from outreach and articulation areas; goal is to establish consistent, knowledgeable academic program-centered advisement for CCC students reflecting curricular cohesion between the segments.	CSU Academic Senate; CCC C.O. and CSU C.O. staff - AAPP and AAES.	CCC and CSU C.O.'s and representatives from Academic Senates develop charge and recommend membership of joint committee appointed by respective Chancellors.	Appoint committee spring, 1989; report and recommendations due December, 1989.	Limited. Possible resource implications if survey is recommended by the joint committee.

ITEM	CURRENT STATUS	ACTION	UNIT/DIV. RESP.	PROCESS/CONSULT.	TIMELINE	RESOURCE IMPL'S
3. Development of regional articulation councils.	At least eight formal intersegmental regional councils currently are operational. In most cases, these are comprised of administrative and/or program staff who are responsible for transfer/ articulation; generally effective in addressing practices that enhance and ease the transfer/ transition process.	Expand and modify to include greater faculty participation; all CSU campuses should actively participate in such regional councils or assume leadership in their development where they do not exist; structures should be used to enhance faculty participation through the disciplines(majors).	C.O.-AAES provide encouragement, monitor and assess effectiveness; leadership in faculty participation at the local level should come from AAVP's, department heads and campus academic senates/councils; course content and mastery issues and expected competencies increasingly be the focus of such councils.	Campuses assess effectiveness of councils/ consortia and seek to enhance their utilization as a primary means of improving articulation and establishing faculty interaction.	Immediate and on-going.	None; campus participation should be considered a basic component of overall approach to enhancement of transfer function.
D. GENERAL EDUCATION: Improve policy for transfer of general education courses; address inconsistencies among CSU campuses; develop common certification forms for certifying coursework. Work toward automated certification on transcript.	Inconsistent policy implementation can increase time to degree and may affect access to CSU. CSU, CCC, UC are developing a common transfer curriculum; some aspects still to be resolved; CSU Senate to take action in January, 1989.	Certification forms need to be developed at system level in both CSU and CCC.	C.O. take the lead. AAP working on transfer policy; AAES assists with certification.	C.O. staff and Academic Senate consulation; informational meetings with campus departments and faculty. G.E. Advisory Committee takes the lead.	Ongoing	None.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUN 16 1989